2013



Frederick County Local Management Board

Community Wide Needs Assessment

Determining the Strengths, Gaps and Opportunities in the Human Service System for Children and Families in Frederick County

Frederick County Office for Children and Families Home of the Frederick County Local Management Board 5370 Public Safety Place Frederick, MD 21704

Introduction

The Frederick County Office for Children and Families (OCF) is a department within the Citizens Services Division of Frederick County Government. OCF seeks to create a more efficient and effective system of care for the children and families of Frederick County.

OCF is also the home of the Frederick County Local Management Board (LMB). The State of Maryland mandates that all counties/jurisdictions (23 counties and the city of Baltimore) have an LMB to oversee interagency services to children and families, create a results based system and minimize duplication of services.

The LMB guides OCF in governing, allocating resources, monitoring and evaluating family services and is composed of private and public members.

Frederick County, Maryland comprises the largest geographic area in the state and the eighth highest population. Frederick County's population continues to grow both in diversity and density, as the county saw the third largest population increase from 2000-2010 (19.5%) within the state. Frederick County has over 85,000 households and nearly 60,000 children. It is these children, and the system of care that supports them, that is the focus of the Frederick County Local Management Board (LMB).

In January of 2013, the Frederick County Local Management Board began the process of developing an action plan to address the human service needs of Frederick County's children and families. The first step was to conduct a county-wide needs assessment to identify the strengths and resources, as well as the gaps and challenges, deemed to be present in the current system of services for children, youth, and families. The needs assessment provides the framework for the Frederick County Local Management Board to develop services and solutions aimed at building a local system of care which supports and empowers children, youth, and their families.

In a thoughtful manner, which built on the success and community-wide utility of the FY10 needs assessment, Frederick County's LMB was determined to implement a meaningful, multifaceted and cost-sensitive assessment which relied on human resources of the LMB staff and board members in collecting community information. Multiple mechanisms were utilized to gather and report county-wide data:

- U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2011 American Community Survey 3-year estimates
- Maryland Results and Indicators for Childhood Well-Being
- 21 Focus Groups
 - o 7 LMB Committee/Community Provider Focus Groups
 - o 8 Family Focus Groups
 - o 6 Youth Focus Groups
- Web-Based Surveys

Frederick County Demographic Data

U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2011 American Community Survey 3-year estimates.



American Factfinder Data

General Characteristics

Characteristic	Frederick County Estimates	Percent	U.S. Average	
Total Population	239,582	(X)	313,914,040	
Male	114,806	49.2%	49.0%	
Female	118,579	50.8%	50.1%	
Median age (years)	38.6	(X)	37.4%	
Under 5 years	14,862	6.4%	6.3%	
18 years and over	174,341	74.7%	76.5%	
65 years and over	25,914	11.1%	13.7%	
One race	226,921	97.2%	90.0%	
White	200,530	83.7%	77.9%	
Black or African American	21,801	9.1%	13.1%	
American Indian and Alaska Native	958	0.45%	1.2%	
Asian	10,062	4.2%	5.1%	

Characteristic	Frederick County Estimates	Percent	U.S. Average
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	15	0	0.2%
Some other race	6,684	2.9%	5.8%
Two or more races	6,464	2.8%	2.4%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	17,135	7.3%	16.9%

Social Characteristics

Characteristic	Frederick County Estimates	Percent	U.S. Average		
Population 25 years and over	160,160	67.0%	67.0%		
High school graduate or higher	147,347	92.0%	86.4%		
Bachelor's degree or higher	61,181	38.2%	29.1%		
Civilian veterans (civilian population 18 years and over)	20,045	11.1%	9.1%		
With a Disability	21,241	9.0%	12.2%		
Foreign born	22,192	9.3%	13.0%		

Characteristic	Frederick County Estimates	Percent	U.S. Average
Male, Now married, except separated (population 15 years and over)	52,564	59.1%	49.8%
Female, Now married, except separated (population 15 years and over)	50,954	54.1%	46.3%
Speak a language other than English at home (population 5 years and over)	26,741	11.9%	21.0%

Economic Characteristics

Characteristic	Frederick County Estimates	Percent	U.S. Average
In labor force (population 16 years and over)	130,381	72.6%	78.0%
Mean travel time to work in minutes (workers 16 years and over)	34.1	(X)	25.4
Median household income (in 2012 inflation-adjusted dollars)	\$ 83,706	(X)	\$ 53,046

Characteristic	Frederick County Estimates	Percent	U.S. Average
Per capita income (in 2008 inflation-adjusted dollars)	36,343	(X)	21,587
Families below poverty level	(X)	3.0%	9.2%
Individuals below poverty level	(X)	5.4%	14.3%

Housing Characteristics

Characteristic	Frederick County Estimates	Percent	U.S. Average
Average household size	2.70	(X)	2.63
Average family size	3.17	(X)	3.24
Household population	229,203	(X)	303,593,326
Total housing units	90,980	(X)	132,419,000
Occupied housing units	85,862	94%	114,907,000
Owner-occupied housing units	64,408	71%	76,091,000
Renter-occupied housing units	21,454	24%	38,816,000

Characteristic	Frederick County Estimates	Percent	U.S. Average
Vacant housing units	4,446	5.4%	12.8%
Owner-occupied homes	64,588	(X)	87.2%
Median value (dollars)	298,400	(X)	174,600
With a mortgage (dollars)	51,334	(X)	66.5%
Not mortgaged (dollars)	13,074	(X)	33.5%

 $^{^{\}prime}$ (X) $^{\prime}$ -The value is not applicable or not available. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2011 American Community Survey

Maryland Results and Indicators: Frederick County



Result: Babies Born Healthy

Indicator: Infant Mortality, 2007 – 2012

Definition: Infant mortality rate is the number of infants who die before their first birthday per 1,000 live births.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 4th lowest infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	3.9	8.4	3.8	3.2	3.6	4.4
Carroll	4.8	3.4	4.5	5.0	LNE	3.7
Harford	8.3	5.4	3.2	5.5	3.7	5.3
Howard	4.6	3.8	6.9	6.8	4.7	4.9
Montgomery	5.9	5.6	5.5	4.3	5.3	5.1
Washington	5.6	5.5	7.4	6.2	LNE	4.0
Maryland	8.0	8.0	7.2	6.7	6.7	6.3

Data Source: www.kidscount.org/datacenter -(Infant Mortality) – Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Vital Statistics Administration.

LNE (Low Number Event) a value of 5 or less events and thus not reported

Result: Babies Born Healthy

Indicator: Low Birth Weight, 2007 – 2012

Definition: The rate of low birth weight is the percentage of babies born weighing 2,500 grams (5.5 lbs) or less at birth.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 5th lowest percentage of babies born weighing less than 2,500 grams in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	8.3%	8.0%	7.9%	8.5%	7.5%	8.2%
Carroll	6.3%	6.9%	7.4%	5.8%	5.8%	6.2%
Harford	7.7%	7.4%	7.6%	7.6%	7.3%	6.8%
Howard	7.7%	8.6%	8.6%	7.7%	8.3%	8.0%
Montgomery	7.8%	7.9%	8.2%	7.7%	7.7%	7.4%
Washington	7.9%	6.1%	7.1%	9.1%	7.7%	8.8%
Maryland	9.1%	9.3%	9.2%	8.8%	8.9%	8.8%

Data Source: www.kidscount.org/datacenter -(Low Birth Weight) – Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Vital Statistics Administration.

Result: Babies Born Healthy

Indicator: Births to Adolescents, 2007 – 2012

Definition: This is a population-based rate of the number of births to women ages 15-19, per 1,000 women 15-19.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 6th lowest teen birth rate of women ages 15-19 in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	26.1	24.2	22.9	19.8	15.0	14.4
Carroll	21.2	17.1	14.2	15.5	11.6	13.4
Harford	26.1	20.0	19.7	16.9	12.4	14.9
Howard	14.1	13.8	12.9	10.1	8.8	8.3
Montgomery	22.0	20.9	20.3	17.4	14.1	13.5
Washington	58.0	46.9	40.8	36.0	38.1	36.2
Maryland	34.4	32.7	31.2	27.2	24.7	22.1

Data Source: www.kidscount.org/datacenter -(Teen Birth Rate) – Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Vital Statistics Administration.

Result: Babies Born Healthy

Indicator: Early Prenatal Care, 2007 – 2012

Definition: Early Prenatal Care is the percentage of all births where prenatal care was initiated in the first trimester of pregnancy.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County ranked 9th for women receiving early prenatal care in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	75.4%	78.2%	80.3%	76.0%	74.6%	76.8%
Carroll	90.2%	90.7%	90.7%	73.6%	76.8%	74.1%
Harford	85.1%	84.2%	85.0%	78.7%	78.7%	78.0%
Howard	95.0%	94.6%	92.3%	73.2%	78.7%	71.8%
Montgomery	83.3%	84.0%	81.0%	69.3%	66.9%	66.5%
Washington	79.6%	80.2%	79.6%	64.0%	68.1%	71.1%
Maryland	79.5%	80.3%	80.2%	69.0%	67.7%	67.9%

Data Source: www.kidscount.org/datacenter - (Women without early prenatal care) - Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Vital Statistics Administration.

Note: While this indicator informs us of the percentage of births where prenatal care was initiated during the first trimester, it does not indicate the adequacy of the care or if care was continued throughout the pregnancy.

Result: Healthy Children

Indicator: Child Deaths, 1-14, 2007 – 2012

Definition: This is the number of child deaths resulting from all causes for children ages 1-14.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 17th lowest number of child deaths for children ages 1-14, in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	9	7	9	LNE	10	7
Carroll	LNE	7	LNE	LNE	5	5
Harford	7	LNE	6	5	LNE	7
Howard	8	11	5	6	7	5
Montgomery	28	26	23	25	15	24
Washington	LNE	LNE	LNE	5	8	LNE
Maryland	222	196	167	149	154	157

Data Source: www.kidscount.org/datacenter

LNE (Low Number Event) a value of 5 or less events and thus not reported

Result: Healthy Children

Indicator: Child Deaths, 15-19, 2007 – 2012

Definition: This is the number of child deaths resulting from all causes for children ages 15-19.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 13th lowest number of child deaths for children ages 15-19, in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	10	5	8	LNE	6	5
Carroll	5	10	5	5	LNE	7
Harford	14	12	6	11	13	11
Howard	9	9	10	7	7	10
Montgomery	23	32	20	23	15	11
Washington	8	6	5	LNE	LNE	6
Maryland	272	241	198	194	203	194

Data Source: www.kidscount.org/datacenter

LNE (Low Number Event) a value of 5 or less events and thus not reported

Result: School Readiness

Indicator: Kindergarten Readiness,

2007/08 - 2012/13

Definition: This indicator reflects the composite score from the Maryland Model for School Readiness (MMSR). The MMSR is an assessment of kindergarten students to determine if they have the social, physical, linguistic, and cognitive skills to be successful in kindergarten. It is a percentage of the number of kindergarten students demonstrating readiness.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 10th highest percentage of kindergarten students demonstrating readiness on the MMSR for the 2012/2013 school year tied with Allegany and Anne Arundel Counties.

	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Frederick	76%	77%	87%	88%	88%	86%
Carroll	63%	69%	96%	95%	95%	96%
Harford	82%	84%	82%	85%	87%	87%
Howard	76%	76%	82%	86%	87%	89%
Montgomery	70%	73%	76%	74%	81%	80%
Washington	69%	72%	73%	76%	78%	75%
Maryland	68%	73%	78%	81%	83%	82%

Data Source: Maryland State Department of Education.

Result: School Success

Indicator: Maryland School Assessment,

3rd Grade, Mathematics,

2008 - 2013

Definition: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) for math achievement.

Rank: Frederick County had the 8th highest percentage of 3rd grade students performing at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the MSA for math achievement in Maryland for 2013.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Frederick	87%	89%	91%	91%	93%	87%
Carroll	92%	91%	93%	92%	95%	92%
Harford	89%	87%	87%	88%	90%	87%
Howard	89%	90%	91%	93%	93%	92%
Montgomery	86%	87%	88%	89%	90%	78%
Washington	86%	88%	87%	86%	87%	81%
Maryland	83%	85%	86%	86%	88%	82%

Result: School Success

Indicator: Maryland School Assessment,

3rd Grade, Reading,

2008 - 2013

Definition: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) for reading achievement.

Rank: Frederick County had the 5th highest percentage of 3rd grade students performing at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the MSA for reading achievement in Maryland for 2013.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Frederick	87%	90%	89%	92%	91%	90%
Carroll	91%	90%	89%	88%	90%	90%
Harford	87%	87%	86%	87%	89%	89%
Howard	91%	91%	90%	93%	92%	92%
Montgomery	86%	89%	87%	89%	89%	86%
Washington	86%	88%	83%	82%	83%	76%
Maryland	83%	85%	84%	86%	85%	83%

Result: School Success

Indicator: Maryland School Assessment,

8th Grade, Mathematics,

2008 - 2013

Definition: The percentage of 8th grade students scoring at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) for math achievement.

Rank: Frederick County had the 9th highest percentage of 8th grade students performing at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the MSA for math achievement in Maryland for 2013.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Frederick	75%	76%	76%	78%	80%	75%
Carroll	75%	78%	75%	76%	81%	83%
Harford	64%	69%	70%	73%	73%	75%
Howard	80%	85%	85%	85%	86%	82%
Montgomery	74%	75%	76%	75%	77%	75%
Washington	76%	80%	75%	78%	79%	78%
Maryland	62%	66%	66%	66%	69%	67%

Result: School Success

Indicator: Maryland School Assessment,

8th Grade, Reading,

2008 - 2013

Definition: The percentage of 8th grade students scoring at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) for reading achievement.

Rank: Frederick County had the 7th highest percentage of 8th grade students performing at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the MSA for reading achievement in Maryland for 2013.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Frederick	83%	87%	88%	91%	89%	88%
Carroll	87%	89%	91%	89%	91%	90%
Harford	82%	86%	88%	88%	85%	85%
Howard	87%	91%	90%	93%	91%	91%
Montgomery	83%	88%	88%	89%	88%	89%
Washington	78%	85%	80%	86%	83%	86%
Maryland	73%	80%	81%	83%	81%	81%

Result: School Success

Indicator: Maryland School Assessment,

High School, Algebra,

2008 - 2013

Definition: The percentage of all high school students scoring at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) for Algebra.

Rank: Frederick County had the 10th highest percentage of high school students performing at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the MSA for Algebra in Maryland for 2013.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Frederick	90%	92%	92%	91%	93%	92%
Carroll	94%	95%	93%	93%	95%	>95%
Harford	92%	92%	91%	89%	89%	91%
Howard	>95%	>95%	95%	>95%	95%	>95%
Montgomery	88%	90%	88%	89%	90%	90%
Washington	94%	95%	94%	95%	95%	93%
Maryland	84%	85%	84%	84%	84%	84%

Result: School Success

Indicator: Maryland School Assessment,

High School, Biology,

2008 - 2013

Definition: The percentage of all high school students scoring at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) for Biology.

Rank: Frederick County had the 8th highest percentage of high school students performing at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the MSA for Biology in Maryland for 2013.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Frederick	91%	92%	91%	90%	90%	90%
Carroll	91%	92%	92%	89%	91%	93%
Harford	89%	89%	87%	86%	84%	88%
Howard	94%	94%	93%	94%	95%	94%
Montgomery	90%	91%	89%	90%	90%	90%
Washington	87%	88%	89%	90%	90%	89%
Maryland	82%	83%	81%	81%	82%	83%

Result: School Success

Indicator: Maryland School Assessment,

High School, English,

2008 - 2013

Definition: The percentage of all high school students scoring at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the Maryland School Assessment (MSA) for English.

Rank: Frederick County had the 6th highest percentage of high school students performing at the 'Advanced' and 'Proficient' levels on the MSA for English in Maryland for 2013.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Frederick	88%	90%	86%	88%	90%	90%
Carroll	90%	91%	89%	87%	93%	92%
Harford	86%	86%	81%	84%	84%	87%
Howard	93%	93%	90%	91%	92%	92%
Montgomery	87%	87%	86%	87%	89%	89%
Washington	83%	85%	83%	88%	89%	89%
Maryland	82%	84%	80%	82%	83%	83%

Result: School Success

Indicator: Truancy, 2007/08 – 2012-13

Definition: This data element is the percentage of all students who missed more than twenty days of school during the school year.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 7th lowest percentage of students who missed more than twenty days of school for the 2012/2013 school year.

	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Frederick	9.0%	9.6%	9.0%	8.9%	8.4%	8.1%
Carroll	7.3%	6.8%	7.2%	7.2%	6.9%	7.0%
Harford	10.1%	10.6%	9.8%	9.4%	9.3%	8.9%
Howard	5.6%	5.5%	6.3%	6.3%	5.9%	5.7%
Montgomery	7.9%	6.9%	6.7%	7.1%	9.4%	9.5%
Washington	6.4%	6.3%	7.3%	7.5%	7.5%	7.4%
Maryland	12.0%	11.3%	11.2%	11.3%	10.8%	11.1%

Data Source: Maryland State Department of Education

Result: School Completion

Indicator: High School Dropout Rate,

2007 - 2012

Definition: This data element is the percentage of public school students, grades 9 through 12, who withdrew from school before graduation or completing a Maryland approved educational program.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 2nd lowest percentage of students who withdrew from school before graduation in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	0.96%	1.7%	1.7%	1.2%	1.3%	1.1%
Carroll	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.94%	1.0%	1.0%
Harford	3.2%	2.9%	2.3%	2.1%	2.4%	2.3%
Howard	1.2%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.6%	1.6%
Montgomery	2.7%	2.9%	2.7%	2.0%	2.1%	2.2%
Washington	2.5%	1.7%	1.6%	1.8%	1.9%	1.9%
Maryland	3.5%	3.4%	2.8%	2.5%	3.2%	3.5%

Data Source: Maryland State Department of Education.

Result: School Completion

Indicator: High School Program Completion,

2007 - 2012

Definition: This data element is the percentage of graduating students who have completed the minimum requirements for admission into the University System of Maryland in addition to completion of requirements to receive a high school diploma.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 2nd highest percentage of students who completed minimum requirements for admission into USM in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	67.8%	67.8%	68.7%	73.7%	72.7%	75.7%
Carroll	58.0%	58.0%	48.3%	45.7%	46.4%	44.5%
Harford	61.1%	61.1%	56.0%	47.6%	52.3%	50.7%
Howard	38.9%	38.9%	68.9%	67.1%	64.1%	64.7%
Montgomery	67.4%	67.4%	60.5%	73.7%	71.5%	70.4%
Washington	53.5%	53.5%	55.2%	55.2%	58.3%	61.7%
Maryland	55.7%	59.5%	55.3%	55.2%	58.4%	57.9%

Result: School Completion

Indicator: High School Graduation Rate,

2007 - 2012

Definition: The percentage of students who received a Maryland high school diploma during the reported school year. This is an estimated cohort rate. It is calculated by dividing the number of high school graduates by the sum of the dropouts for grades 9 through 12, respectively, in consecutive years, plus the number of high school graduates.

Rank: Frederick County had the 2nd highest Graduation Rate Percentage in the State of Maryland in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	96.22%	94.78%	94.08%	94.56%	92.56%	94.47%
Carroll	94.18%	93.81%	95.47%	95.31%	95.0%	93.23%
Harford	87.17%	86.72%	86.73%	88.38%	89.66%	88.94%
Howard	94.79%	94.87%	93.64%	94.31%	92.73%	92.07%
Montgomery	90.37%	89.08%	87.38%	90.01%	89.39%	90.16%
Washington	90.09%	91.41%	91.53%	92.36%	91.62%	91.12%
Maryland	85.24%	85.09%	85.24%	86.55%	85.51%	86.32%

Data Source: Maryland State Department of Education/2013 Maryland Report Card

Result: School Transition

Indicator: Educational Attainment, 2007-2012

Definition: The percentage of the population 25 years and older with at least a high school diploma or equivalent.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 5th highest percentage of people 25 years and older with at least a high school diploma or equivalent in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	91.4%	92.2%	92.4%	91.6%	91.7%	92.0%
Carroll	90.6%	89.6%	89.1%	91.9%	91.8%	92.8%
Harford	90.3%	91.5%	92.0%	92.2%	91.9%	92.3%
Howard	94.0%	95.2%	94.5%	94.3%	95.0%	95.7%
Montgomery	91.3%	90.9%	90.1%	90.6%	91.7%	91.1%
Washington	84.1%	81.4%	83.9%	85.2%	85.4%	87.4%
Maryland	87.4%	88.0%	88.2%	88.1%	88.9%	89.1%

Data Source: American Community Survey

Result: Safety

Indicator: Juvenile Violent Felony Offenses,

2007 - 2012

Definition: This is the number of referrals to the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) for a violent felony offense (i.e. homicide, aggravated assault, forcible rape, robbery), for youth ages 10-17.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 15th lowest number of youth referred to DJS for a violent felony offense in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	79	75	85	47	55	48
Carroll	36	36	58	33	17	23
Harford	104	85	71	77	64	64
Howard	66	85	90	89	80	75
Montgomery	428	487	401	352	331	337
Washington	45	45	38	37	54	45
Maryland	4250	4238	1112	3387	2898	2675

Data Source: Governors Office for Children – Results and Indicators.

Result: Safety

Indicator: Juvenile Non-Violent

Felony Offenses,

2007 - 2012

Definition: This is the number of referrals to the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) for a non-violent felony offense (i.e. burglary, larceny theft, motor vehicle theft, etc.), for youth ages 10-17.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 18th lowest number of juveniles referred to DJS for a non-violent felony offense in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	112	128	131	90	72	78
Carroll	59	82	91	67	41	32
Harford	160	180	112	96	86	67
Howard	125	103	150	105	84	102
Montgomery	521	629	595	393	266	289
Washington	114	113	102	69	61	58
Maryland	6957	7291	6358	4371	3419	3067

Data Source: Governors Office for Children - Results and Indicators. Maryland State Police, Uniform Crime Reporting Division.

Result: Safety

Indicator: Twelve Month Juvenile and/or

Criminal Justice Recidivism Rates,

2008 - 2012

Definition: This is the percentage of juveniles re-arrested one year after release.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 18th lowest percentage of juveniles re-arrested one year after release in 2012.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	43.1%	53.1%	59.6%	65.8%	53.5%
Carroll	40.8%	53.3%	50.0%	60.0%	61.9%
Harford	60.0%	58.3%	57.9%	64.3%	45.7%
Howard	60.0%	63.6%	72.2%	71.4%	77.3%
Montgomery	50.5%	53.0%	47.8%	54.5%	51.7%
Washington	71.6%	57.1%	62.9%	56.6%	52.7%
Maryland	56.3%	57.3%	56.1%	56.3%	52.9%

Data Source: www.djs.state.md.us/data-resource-guides.asp

Result: Stability

Indicator: Out of Home Placements,

2006-2011

Definition: This data element is the out-of-home placement entry rate per 1,000 children.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 7th lowest rate of out-of-home placements per 1,000 children in 2011.

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Frederick	7.6	6.5	7.3	8.5	8.3	9.2
Carroll	6.1	7.6	7.3	5.5	8.6	8.2
Harford	6.6	6.3	5.0	7.7	7.0	6.9
Howard	3.0	3.4	3.1	4.4	4.1	4.0
Montgomery	5.0	5.5	5.4	4.4	4.6	5.2
Washington	15.5	17.4	15.3	22.5	15.7	18.2
Maryland	10.1	10.1	9.7	13.1	8.3	8.8

Data Source: Joint Commission Report on Out-of-Home Placements and Family Preservation Services.

Result: Stability

Indicator: Child Poverty, 2007-2012

Definition: The percentage of children under age 18 who live in families with incomes below the federal poverty level.

Rank: In Maryland, Frederick County had the 4th lowest percentage of children under age 18 who live in families with incomes below the federal poverty level in 2012.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Frederick	6.4%	6.5%	7.0%	7.7%	8.8%	9.0%
Carroll	5.2%	6.4%	6.5%	6.9%	7.3%	7.8%
Harford	7.1%	7.3%	7.8%	9.3%	12.3%	10.6%
Howard	4.7%	4.9%	5.6%	6.0%	7.5%	6.9%
Montgomery	5.9%	7.3%	8.3%	9.4%	8.8%	8.3%
Washington	13.3%	12.9%	16.0%	16.8%	17.7%	20.3%
Maryland	10.6%	10.4%	11.8%	13.1%	13.9%	14.1%

Frederick County Data Dashboard



Below is a Data Dashboard, which is a useful tool that presents data in one concise table, as well as depicts trends and the directionality of change in the data over the past 5 years. The dashboard below represents Frederick County's outcomes on the Maryland Eight State Results areas for child and family well-being. Where available, Maryland Comparison Data is presented.

Legend:

Green indicates change in a positive direction.

Yellow indicates that there was no change.

Red indicates change occurred in a negative direction.

Results & Indicators	5 years prior	1 year prior	Current Year	5-yr change	1-yr change	State Comparison Data
				(rate/ % change)	(rate/ % change)	
Babies Born Healthy	2007	2011	2012			2012
Infant Mortality (rate per 1,000)	3.9	3.6	4.4	0.5	0.8	6.3
Low Birth Weight	8.3%	7.5%	8.2%	0.1	0.7	8.8%
Births to Adolescents Ages 15-19 (rate per 1,000)	26.1	15.0	14.4	11.7	0.6	22.1
Healthy Children	2007	2011	2012			2012
Deaths (Ages 1-14, Number)	9	10	7	2	3	157
Deaths (Ages 15-19, Number)	10	6	5	5	1	194
School Readiness	2007	2011	2012			2012
Kindergarten Assessment (Composite Score)	76%	88%	86%	10	2	82%
School Success	2007	2011	2012			2012
Truancy	9.0%	8.4%	8.1%	0.9	0.3	11.1%
Academic Performance- (Advanced & Proficient) MSA	2008	2012	2013			2013
3 rd Grade Reading	87%	91%	90%	3	1	83%
3 rd Grade Math	87%	93%	87%	0	6	82%
8 th Grade Reading	83%	89%	88%	5	1	81%
8 th Grade Math	75%	80%	75%	0	5	67%
Algebra	90%	93%	92%	2	1	84%

Results & Indicators	5 years prior	1 year prior	Current Year	5-yr change	1-yr change	State Comparison Data
				(rate/ % change)	(rate/ % change)	
Biology	91%	90%	90%	1	0	83%
English	88%	90%	90%	2	0	83%
School Completion	2007	2011	2012			2012
Dropout Rate	0.96%	1.3%	1.1%	0.14	0.2	3.5%
High School Program Completion- Univ. of MD	67.8%	72.7%	75.7%	7.9	3.0	57.9%
Graduation Rate	96.22%	92.56%	94.47%	1.75	1.91	86.32%
School Transition	2007	2011	2012			2012
Educational Attainment (Age 25+ with High School Diploma)	91.4%	91.7%	92.0%	0.6%	0.3%	89.1%
Safety	2007	2011	2012			2012
Juvenile Violent Offenses (Number – ages 10 – 17)	79	55	48	31	7	2675
Juvenile Non-violent Offenses (Number – ages 10 – 17)	112	72	78	34	6	3067
Recidivism	43.1% (2008)	65.8%	53.5%	10.4	12.3	52.9%
Stability	2007	2011	2012			2012
Child Poverty	6.4%	8.8%	9.0%	2.6	0.2	14.1%
Out of Home Placements (rate per 1,000)	7.6 (2006)	8.3 (2010)	9.2 (2011)	1.6	0.9	8.8 (2011)

Focus Groups



From January 2013 to October 2013, a total of 21 focus groups were conducted by Local Management Board staff and members. Seven provider focus groups were planned to include LMB subcommittees, as well as 2-1-1 call specialists and a cross section of providers.

Eight family focus groups were conducted with parents from across the county, including families with children participating in the Boys & Girls Club and families participating with Family Partnership. These focus groups were held at times/locations most convenient for families. Cultural competence was addressed by providing resources in Spanish.

A total of 76 youth responses were received from six focus groups conducted with youth from age 11 through ages 21. Focus groups included each of the county's middle school after school programs and one group of youth receiving respite programming.

Partners and Participants

Community Boards and Interagency Collaboratives

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Policy Board (JDPPB)

Boys & Girls Club

Care Management Entity (MD Choices)

Community Agency School Services (CASS)

Department of Juvenile Services

Frederick City Police

Frederick County Office for Children and Families

Frederick County Public Schools

Mental Health Association

Private Citizen

Local Care Team (LCT)

Developmental Disabilities Administration

Department of Juvenile Services

Department of Social Services

Frederick County Health Department – Substance Abuse

Frederick County Office for Children and Families

Frederick County Public Schools

Mental Health Management Agency

Parent Advocate

Local Management Board (LMB)

Department of Juvenile Services

Department of Social Services

Frederick City Police

Frederick County Citizens Services Division

Frederick County Family Partnership

Frederick County Finance Division

Frederick County Health Department

Frederick County Public Schools

Mental Health Association

Mental Health Management Agency

Private Citizens

United Way of Frederick

Way Station, Inc.

Frederick County Public Schools – Guidance Counselors Single Point of Access (2-1-1) Call Specialists Youth Council

Families and Caregivers

Boys & Girls Club (6 groups) Family Partnership (2 groups)

Youth

Boys & Girls Club (5 groups) Camp Journey Respite Program (1 group)

Methodology

Focus group questions were developed and finalized by Local Management Board Members and staff. Each focus group participant received a single sheet of paper containing the focus group questions at the beginning of the group. Participants were asked to record their responses on the paper, as well as participate in a group discussion about each question. All sessions were led by at least one Local Management Board member or staff. Responses were recorded, compiled, and assigned to categories by LMB staff. Categories with more than a single response (n>1) are displayed in the tables that follow.

Results – Community Boards and Interagency Collaboratives

1. Please list three (3) strengths of the current service delivery system.

Response		n	%
Specific programs/initiatives/agencies (see list) *		86	60.1
Community partnerships		20	14.2
Diversity of services		11	7.8
On site counseling services for children with state insura	nce	9	6.4
Access to mental health treatment		6	4.3
Caring staff		4	2.8
Referrals are facilitated		3	2.1
Agencies are building rapport with families		2	1.4
	Total	141	100

Specific Programs (n>1):

2-1-1	29
Child Find	10
Family Preservation	11
Community Agency School Services (CASS)	7
Frederick County Public School System	5
Brooklane Services	4
Child Protective Services	4
Kids Like Us	3
Mental Health Guide Book	3
Systems Navigation	3
Head Start	2
Mobile Crisis Unit	2

2. Please list three (3) weaknesses of the current service delivery system.

Response		n	%
Limitations/lack of specific services (see list) *		54	32.7
Interagency communication		14	8.5
Transportation		12	7.3
Systems barriers/eligibility criteria/bureaucracy		11	6.7
Economic downturn/decrease in staffing and services		10	6.1
Lack of services for unaccompanied youth (youth over 18)		10	6.1
Lack of resources/ affordable housing		9	5.5
Barriers with specific agencies		8	4.8
Barriers/lack of resources for low income families		8	4.8
Lack of parenting and prevention support		5	3.0
Services/ opportunities for children and adolescents with		5	3.0
disabilities			
Lack of psychiatrist, psychologist and therapist that are		4	2.4
trained to work with children			
No single point of entry/ "one stop shop"		4	2.4
Resources are provided but there is no assistance with		3	1.8
follow through			
Awareness / linking to resources		2	1.2
Family communication /follow through		2	1.2
Lack of interpreters/agency cultural competence		2	1.2
Other		2	1.2
	Total	165	100

Limitations/Lack of Specific Services (n>1):

Community Agency School Services (CASS)	24
Kids on the Block	12
Behavior Intervention Services	3
Mental Health Services	3
Project 103	3
Family Preservation	2
Kids Like Us	2
Multisystemic Therapy (MST) Model	2
Systems Navigation	2

3. Please list three (3) barriers to children and families accessing the current service delivery system.

Response	n		%
Transportation	3	4	24.3
Awareness of available services	2	0	14.3
Insufficient family finances / families cannot afford services	1	6	11.4
Family follow-through	1	1	7.9
Lack of availability of specific services (see list) *	1	1	7.9
Programs operating at capacity / waiting list	9	(6.4
Families lacking health insurance/limited insurance	6	4	4.3
coverage			
Lack of interpreters/ agency cultural competence	6	4	4.3
Lack of non-traditional hours for services	6	4	4.3
Decrease in funding/ resources/ staffing	4	,	2.9
Lack of follow up after service is provided	3	,	2.1
Restrictive eligibility criteria for services	3		2.1
Stigma of receiving services	3	,	2.1
Affordable housing	2		1.4
Available affordable child care	2		1.4
Resources are not consistent	2		1.4
Other	2		1.4
Т	otal 1-	40	100

Specific Services (n>1):

In home supports	4
Community Agency School Services (CASS)	2
Access to mental health care	2

4. Please list the three (3) biggest problems for children, ages 0-5 and their families in the current service delivery system?

Response		n	%
Lack of parenting skills		13	15.3
Affordable / available child care		12	14.1
Limitations / lack of specific services (see list) *		12	14.1
Child abuse/neglect		11	12.9
Lack of ways to identify Children with special needs		10	11.8
Interagency barriers		7	8.2
Insufficient family finances		6	7.1
Lack of housing resources		6	7.1
Other		6	7.1
Transportation		2	2.4
	Total	85	100

Lack of Specific Services (n>1):

In home supports for families 2
Prenatal care resources 2
Quality psychiatric care 2
Therapeutic programs 2

5. Please list the three (3) biggest problems for children, ages 6-12 and their families in the current service delivery system.

Response		n	%
Affordable, quality after school programs		16	16.7
Lack of parenting skills		14	14.6
Insufficient family finances		13	13.5
Lack of funding for services for prevention		11	11.5
Limitations/lack of specific services (see list) *		9	9.4
Lack of coordination of services		8	8.3
Limited early intervention/prevention		5	5.2
Lack of health insurance / health care		4	4.2
Lack of role models / mentors		4	4.2
Other		4	4.2
Family stressors / unstable family structure		2	2.1
Lack of awareness of services		2	2.1
Lack of special education services/supports		2	2.1
Lack of support for families that deal with behavior issues		2	2.1
	Total	96	100

Limitations/Lack of Specific Services (n>1):

Early diagnoses	2	Respite care	2
Home school service agency	2	Therapeutic programs	2

6. Please list the three (3) biggest problems for children, ages 13-18 and their families in the current service delivery system.

Response	n	0/0
Limitations / lack of specific services (see list) *	32	33.7
Lack of affordable housing	13	13.7
Substance abuse	8	8.4
Vocational Training / programming	7	7.4
Behavior issues	6	6.3
Lack of parental supervision / involvement	6	6.3
Parent education / support	5	5.3
Overwhelming system to navigate	4	4.2
Lack of role models / mentors	3	3.2
Other	3	3.2
Services difficult to access	3	3.2
Transportation	3	3.2
Bullying	2	2.1
Total	95	100

Limitations/Lack of Specific Services (n>1):

Lack of early intervention programs	6
Mental health services	6
Disbursal of information	3
Drug counseling	3
Recreational programming	3
Sex Education	3
Overall lack of services	2

7. Please list the three (3) biggest problems for children, ages 19-21 and their families in the current service delivery system.

Response		n	%
Vocational training / programming		23	24.7
Limitations / lack of specific services (see list) *		15	16.1
Aging out of needed programs		14	15.1
Transitional housing / homelessness		13	14.0
Other		8	8.6
Lack of services for youth with developmental disabilities		5	5.4
Lack of independent living skills		4	4.3
Interpreters		3	3.2
Stigma of receiving services		3	3.2
Transportation		3	3.2
Poverty		2	2.2
	Total	93	100

Limitations/Lack of Specific Services (n>1):

Lack of mental health services in schools	5
Lack of transition services for youth with intensive needs	3
Substance abuse counseling	3
Mentoring programs	2

8. If you could improve three (3) aspects of the current service delivery system, what would they be?

Response		n	0/0
Addition / expansion of specific services (see list) *		40	43.0
Better service coordination / interagency communication		17	18.3
Improved access to services/ single point of entry		8	8.6
Financial support for families		5	5.4
Housing		5	5.4
Other		5	5.4
A flow chart with available services		4	4.3
Transportation		4	4.3
Improved cultural competence within agencies / system		3	3.2
Expanded eligibility criteria for services		2	2.2
	Total	93	100

Addition/Expansion of Specific Services (n>1):

Community Agency School Services (CASS)	11	Substance abuse counseling	3
In home services	5	Mental health services	2
Respite	5	Social workers in all schools	2

9. What three (3) aspects of the current service delivery system are working well and should be maintained?

Response		n	%
Specific services (see list) *		98	95.1
Quality of services and personnel		3	2.9
Collaboration		2	1.9
	Total	103	100

Specific Services (n>1):

2-1-1	22
Family Preservation	12
Child Find	10
Systems Navigation	9
Way Station, Inc.	8
Community Agency School Services (CASS)	5
Mobile Crisis	4
Family Partnership	3
Frederick Community College Adult Education	3
Health Department	3
Boys & Girls Club After School Programs	2
Child Protective Services	2
Head Start	2
Kids Like Us	2
Mental Health Booklet	2

10. Do you feel there is a sufficient level of cultural competence in the current service delivery system?

Response		n	%
Yes		19	40
No		29	60
	Total	48	100

What could be improved (n>1)?

Response		n	%
More sensitivity trainings are needed		11	27.5
Staff diversity		10	25.0
Interpretation services are needed		6	15.0
Need cultural connections with volunteers from the community for		5	12.5
community outreach			
It has improved but we still need a liaison to coordinate services		4	10.0
Local Government does not seem "friendly" toward diversity		2	5.0
More services are needed for the Hispanic community		2	5.0
	Total	40	100

11. Do you feel like there is a sufficient level of family involvement in guiding the current service delivery system?

Response		n	%
Yes		12	29.2
No		22	53.7
Unsure		7	17.1
	Total	41	100

What could be improved (n>1):

Response		n	%
It would be great to have more focus groups and talk directly with families about their perceptions of service.		4	22.2
Make sure parents understand forms and have assistance with paperwork. Make sure they understand what is being said to them.		4	22.2
Strength based approach is needed to empower parents and children to make good decisions.		4	22.2
Families seem to be on the receiving end but not the development process of services.		2	11.1
It is a challenge to get families to take more responsibility.		2	11.1
There is a need for more family advocates.		2	11.1
	Total	18	100

Results – Families and Caregivers

1. What are the ages of your children?

Age Range		n	%
0-5		48	31.2
6-12		66	42.9
13-18		33	21.4
0-5 6-12 13-18 19-21		7	4.5
	Total	154	100

2. Based on your experiences, what do you consider to be the three (3) biggest problems for children?

Response		n	0/0
Lack of medical/dental insurance		24	12.0
Poverty		23	11.5
Home environment		20	10.0
Problems with education		16	8.0
Transportation		16	8.0
Bullying		11	5.5
Crime		9	4.5
Not being able to speak English/ lack of interpreters		9	4.5
Employment		8	4.0
Housing		8	4.0
Knowing what services are available		7	3.5
Lack of affordable child care		7	3.5
Social issues		7	3.5
Affordable activities		6	3.0
Discrimination		6	3.0
Lack of after school programs		6	3.0
Crisis intervention		4	2.0
Poor Nutrition		4	2.0
Too much electronic involvement		4	2.0
Lack of Head Start openings		3	1.5
Not having a Social Security number		2	1.0
	Total	200	100

3. What do you think are the three (3) greatest strengths of the system?

Response		n	%
Boys and Girls Club		19	13.3
WIC		16	11.2
Judy Center		14	9.8
Family Literacy		10	7.0
Accommodation for people with disabilities		9	6.3
YMCA		9	6.3
Social Services / Community Action		7	4.9
Family Partnership		6	4.2
Way Station		5	3.5
211		4	2.8
Better food in schools		4	2.8
Head Start		4	2.8
Family Literacy		3	2.1
Health Department		3	2.1
Home work assistance		3	2.1
Variety of programs offered to children		3	2.1
ARC		2	1.4
Camp Journey		2	1.4
Child Advocacy Center		2	1.4
Child Protective Services		2	1.4
Child Support		2	1.4
Food Stamps		2	1.4
Frederick County Public Schools food program		2	1.4
Heartly House		2	1.4
Medical Assistance		2	1.4
Medication Medical Insurance		2	1.4
Multiple Providers for Mental Health		2	1.4
Social Security		2	1.4
	Total	143	100

4. What do you think are the three (3) greatest weaknesses?

Response	n	0/0
Lack of medical, dental and life insurance for adults	24	19.7
Transportation	23	18.9
Financial support	16	13.1
Not knowing what services are available	12	9.8
Lack of services	8	6.6
Education concerns	6	4.9
Qualification for services	6	4.9
Rude employees at social services	6	4.9
Poor communication between agencies	4	3.3
Lack of Health Department services	4	3.3
Mission of Mercy	3	2.5
Connecting families with similar needs	2	1.6
Cost of services	2	1.6
Living conditions	2	1.6
Waiting list for DDA Services	2	1.6
Working with police or sheriff	2	1.6
T	Total 122	100

5. What are the three (3) greatest barriers to accessing services?

Response		n	%
Transportation		19	18.3
Lack of interpreters		15	14.4
Finances/Economy		10	9.6
Not having medical insurance		10	9.6
Lack of information about places to get assistance		9	8.7
Not having a Social Security number		6	5.8
Wait time		6	5.8
Bad mannered people/staff that do not make an effort		4	3.8
Discrimination		4	3.8
Hours of operation for services (no evening)		4	3.8
Not having a job		4	3.8
Not meeting the financial criteria		4	3.8
Gas		3	2.9
Completing applications and not receiving a response		2	1.9
Lack of immediate help and police only to assist		2	1.9
Lack of internet access		2	1.9
r	Γotal	104	100

6. Do you feel there is a sufficient level of cultural competence in the current child and family service system?

Response		n	%
Yes		44	67.7
Yes No		21	32.3
	Total	65	100

7. Do you feel there is a sufficient level of family involvement in guiding the current child/family service system?

Response		n	%
Yes		50	78.1
No		14	21.9
	Total	64	100

Results – Youth

1. What do you think are the three (3) biggest problems that youth your age are experiencing today?

Response	n	%	
Education/homework problems/school pressure	30	16.8	
Social problems/making friends	28	15.6	
Substance abuse/resisting drugs	26	14.5	
Bullying	22	12.3	
Financial concerns/housing/hunger/employment	20	11.2	
Crime	10	5.6	
Pregnancy/lack of sex education	10	5.6	
Family issues	8	4.5	
Peer pressure	8	4.5	
Boredom/lack of recreational activities	6	3.4	
Emotional problems/depression	6	3.4	
Puberty	3	1.7	
Racism	2	1.1	
Total	179	100	

2. What supports or programs do you wish were available for youth your age?

Response		n	%
After school sports programs/intramural sports		29	25.9
More after school clubs and activities		28	25.0
Job/life skills		16	14.3
Mental health supports		9	8.0
Recreational/social opportunities		9	8.0
Services for the homeless		8	7.1
Tutoring		7	6.3
Bullying/gang prevention classes		4	3.6
Food		2	1.8
	Total	112	100

Web-Based Survey



On October 17, 2013, a web-based survey was released to over 60 Frederick County child and family serving agencies, as well as local elected officials, who were identified by the Local Management Board as key sources of information about community needs and resources for children and families. A reminder was sent on October 30th and the survey closed at midnight on November 1st. In total, 127 responses were received.

Survey Recipients

Advocates for the Homeless

Arc of Frederick County

Behavioral Health Partners of Frederick

Big Brothers/Big Sisters

Boys & Girls Club

Community Action Agency

Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA)

Department of Rehabilitative Services (DORS)

Department of Juvenile Services

Department of Social Services

Developmental Disabilities Administration

Families Plus

Fort Detrick Family Support Center

Frederick City Housing

Frederick City Police

Frederick Community College

Frederick Community Meditation and Conflict Resolution Center (CALM)

Frederick County Government

Board of County Commissioners

Child Advocacy Center

Citizens Services Administration

Family Partnership

Health Department

Housing

Human Relations Department

Parks & Recreation

Sheriff's Office

TransIT

Workforce Services

Frederick County Public Schools

Adult Education

CASS

Curriculum

Homeless Education Program

Judy Center

Office of Education that is Multicultural

Psychological Services

Student Services

Frederick Memorial Hospital

Goodwill

Head Start

Healthy Families Frederick

Heartly House

Hope Alive

Institute for Family Centered Services

Jefferson School

Lead4Life, Inc.

Maryland Choices

Maryland Cooperative Extension

Maryland Sheriff's Youth Ranch

Maryland School for the Deaf

Mental Health Association

Mental Health Management Agency

Religious Coalition

Rescue Mission

SAFE Kids

Salvation Army

Seton Center

TeamLink

ThorpeWood, Inc.

UNESCO Center for Peace

United Way

Villa Maria of Frederick County

Way Station, Inc.

YMCA

Methodology

The eight question web survey was developed by LMB members and staff to complement the information obtained through the focus groups. The survey was created and disseminated through surveymonkey.com. Surveys were e-mailed to agency directors, supervisors, and managers with a request to both complete the survey and to forward it to agency colleagues and staff. A request was included to forgo completing the survey if the recipient had already participated in a focus group, but instead to only forward the survey.

Opportunities throughout the survey to explain responses or to insert additional information generated additional comments and recommendations. These responses were assigned to categories by LMB staff. Categories with more than a single response (n>1) are displayed in the tables that follow.

Results

1. Based on your personal and/or professional experiences, what do you consider to be the three (3) biggest problems for children and families in Frederick County? Please choose up to three (3) for each age group.

Children 0-5

Response	r	1	%
Lack of affordable childcare	7	77	19.7
Lack of parenting skills/knowledge/support/parental	5	58	14.8
involvement			
Funding cuts/loss of services	5	55	14.1
Lack of sufficient early education services	4	15	11.5
Lack of affordable housing	4	13	11.0
Lack of affordable, nutritious foods	2	22	5.6
Knowing what services are available	2	20	5.1
Lack of affordable/available dental services	1	16	4.1
Lack of affordable/available primary healthcare	1	15	3.8
Lack of afterschool programs/activities/supervision	1	12	3.1
Lack of role models/mentoring/positive influences	1	12	3.1
Lack of affordable/available mental health services	1	10	2.6
Lack of jobs/vocational training/career development	2	2	0.5
Lack of substance abuse prevention programming	2	2	0.5
Life Skills	2	2	0.5
Te	otal 3	391	100

Children 6-12

Response		n	0/0
Lack of afterschool programs/activities/supervision		65	13.5
Lack of parenting skills/knowledge/support/parental		52	10.8
involvement			
Lack of affordable housing		46	9.5
Lack of affordable childcare		38	7.9
Lack of role models/mentoring/positive influences		38	7.9
Funding cuts/loss of services		34	7.1
Knowing what services are available		26	5.4
Lack of sufficient early education services		25	5.2
Lack of affordable, nutritious foods		24	5.0
Lack of affordable/available mental health services		22	4.6
Lack of affordable/available dental services		21	4.4
Increase in gang activity/negative peer influences		19	3.9
Lack of affordable/available primary healthcare		17	3.5
Lack of substance abuse prevention programming		17	3.5
Life Skills		14	2.9
Lack of sex education programs/increase in teen pregnancy		13	2.7
Lack of jobs/vocational training/career development		6	1.2
Lack of transitional programming/services for older youth		5	1.0
	Total	482	100

Children 13-18

Response		n	0/0
Lack of afterschool programs/activities/supervision		65	11.0
Increase in gang activity/negative peer influences		53	9.0
Lack of parenting skills/knowledge/support/parental		49	8.3
involvement			
Lack of role models/mentoring/positive influences		48	8.1
Lack of affordable housing		44	7.4
Life Skills		39	6.6
Lack of affordable/available mental health services		37	6.3
Lack of jobs/vocational training/career development		34	5.7
Lack of sex education programs/increase in teen pregnancy		32	5.4
Lack of transitional programming/services for older youth		32	5.4
Funding cuts/loss of services		30	5.1
Knowing what services are available		30	5.1
Lack of substance abuse prevention programming		30	5.1
Lack of affordable/available dental services		19	3.2
Lack of affordable/available primary healthcare		17	2.9
Lack of affordable, nutritious foods		15	2.5
Lack of sufficient early education services		11	1.9
Lack of affordable childcare		7	1.2
	Total	592	100

Youth 19-21

Response		n	0/0
Lack of jobs/vocational training/career development		58	11.9
Lack of affordable housing		51	10.5
Lack of transitional programming/services for older youth		48	9.9
Life Skills		47	9.7
Lack of role models/mentoring/positive influences		36	7.4
Increase in gang activity/negative peer influences		34	7.0
Knowing what services are available		32	6.6
Lack of affordable/available mental health services		31	6.4
Lack of substance abuse prevention programming		26	5.3
Lack of parenting skills/knowledge/support/parental		21	4.3
involvement			
Lack of affordable/available dental services		20	4.1
Lack of affordable/available primary healthcare		20	4.1
Funding cuts/loss of services		19	3.9
Lack of sex education programs/increase in teen pregnancy		16	3.3
Lack of afterschool programs/activities/supervision		13	2.7
Lack of affordable childcare		6	1.2
Lack of affordable, nutritious foods		6	1.2
Lack of sufficient early education services		3	0.6
	Total	487	100

2. Based on your knowledge and experiences working with children and families in Frederick County, please indicate up to three (3) strengths of the current service delivery system.

Response		n	0/0
Dedication and commitment of service providers		94	33.0
Coordination/collaboration/partnering between agencies		77	27.0
Specific programs (See List)		33	11.6
Availability of resources/services for families		30	10.5
Convenient/central services		27	9.5
Variety/availability of programs		24	8.4
	Total	285	100

Specific Programs (n>1):

Family Partnership	6	Family Preservation	2
Developmental Center programs	4	Kids Like Us	2
Behavioral Health Partners	3	On the Mark Adolescent Clubhouse	2
Boys & Girls Club	3	Religious Coalition	2
Mental Health Association program	ns 3		

3. Based on your knowledge and experiences working with children and families in Frederick County, what are three(3) barriers to children and families accessing the current service delivery system?

Response		n	%
Funding cuts to programs and services		70	18.3
Transportation/Lack of regional services		65	17.0
Awareness of services/resources		47	12.3
Parenting skills/knowledge/support		47	12.3
Language/cultural barriers/lack of interpreters		40	10.4
Services not available when working parents can access		36	9.4
them			
Affordability of services		33	8.6
Communication between agencies		20	5.2
Eligibility criteria		17	4.4
Service/agency hours		8	2.1
	Total	383	100

4. If you could improve three (3) aspects of the current service delivery system, what would they be?

Response		n	0/0
Improve/provide transportation		53	13.5
Improve response to the housing/homeless crisis		47	12.0
Increase focus on parenting strategies		38	9.7
Improve access to services		37	9.4
Increase vocational programming for young adults		37	9.4
Increase access to good paying jobs for parents		35	8.9
Increase awareness of services		35	8.9
Eliminate gaps in services		33	8.4
Improve language/cultural capabilities		33	8.4
Improve communication between agencies		27	6.9
Increase array of services available		17	4.3
	Total	392	100

5. Listed below are a number of social services and supports. Please check the appropriate circle to indicate how well these services and supports are currently meeting the needs of residents in Frederick County. If you are unaware of a service in Frederick County that would meet a specific need, please choose "N/A".

D (G •	Meets No	Meets Some	Meets Most	Meets All	NT A	Rating
Program/Service	Needs	Needs	Needs	Needs	NA	Average
Addiction Services	1	46	44	10	23	2.62
Foster Care Services	0	45	48	5	24	2.59
Disability Services	0	48	41	5	26	2.54
Outpatient Mental Health Services	1	55	49	4	14	2.51
Primary Healthcare Services	4	46	50	2	18	2.49
Organized Recreational Activities	3	55	36	7	21	2.47
Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention	3	41	31	4	44	2.46
Services						
Mental Health Crisis Support Services	4	54	47	2	17	2.44
Literacy/Tutoring Support	2	58	31	1	31	2.34
Childcare Services	1	76	26	4	16	2.31
Inpatient Mental Health Services	7	58	35	2	19	2.31
Afterschool Programs	1	75	27	3	15	2.30
Parenting Skill Programs/Resources	5	65	31	0	20	2.26
Dental Services	9	58	29	2	25	2.24
Homeless Services	6	76	28	1	12	2.22
Job Training/Internships for Young	10	59	25	0	28	2.16
Adults						
Mentoring Services	5	68	20	0	29	2.16
Transportation Services	9	75	24	1	13	2.16
Low Income Housing Services	9	77	24	0	13	2.14
Violence/Drug Prevention for Young	9	63	21	0	25	2.13
Adults						
Emergency Shelter for Families	12	71	22	1	16	2.11
Support Services for 18-21 Year Olds	18	53	17	0	33	1.99
Transitional Housing for Older Youth	27	43	9	0	41	1.77

6. If you chose a response of "Meets No Needs" or "Meets Some Needs" in Question #5, please provide further explanation. For example: If you chose "Meets Some Needs" for Inpatient Mental Health Services, do you feel that the agencies offering these services are not providing a quality service or do you feel that the need for these services is greater than the ability of the agency(cies) to provide them?

Program/Service	Availability	Quality
Addiction Services	26	2
Foster Care Services	16	5
Disability Services	26	2
Outpatient Mental Health Services	30	2
Primary Healthcare Services	27	1
Organized Recreational Activities	24	1
Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Services	19	1
Mental Health Crisis Support Services	25	1
Literacy/Tutoring Support	26	1
Childcare Services	39	1
Inpatient Mental Health Services	29	1
Afterschool Programs	43	3
Parenting Skill Programs/Resources	29	3
Dental Services	37	1
Homeless Services	40	1
Job Training/Internships for Young Adults	38	1
Mentoring Services	34	2
Transportation Services	40	3
Low Income Housing Services	45	1
Violence/Drug Prevention for Young Adults	31	1
Emergency Shelter for Families	40	2
Support Services for 18-21 Year Olds	39	1
Transitional Housing for Older Youth	31	2

7. Cultural Competence can be defined as a set of congruent behaviors, values, attitudes and policies that come together in a system, agency or among professionals, which enables effective work in cross-cultural situations. (National Center for Cultural Competence) Rate the degree to which you feel that Frederick County's child and family service system is culturally competent.

Full Competence	Moderate Competence	Limited Competence	No Competence	Rating Average
15	75	34	3	2.20

Recommendations for improvement (n>1):

More sensitivity/cultural trainings for providers	11
More bilingual/diverse staff	10
More interpreters/funding for interpreters	9
Increased funding	2

8. Family Involvement can mean that families have a primary decision making role in service provision for their own children, and direct and meaningful input into the programs, policies and systems affecting services for all children in their community. (National Federation of Families/Council on Children and Families) Rate the degree to which you feel that family involvement is utilized to guide Frederick County's service system for children and families.

Full	Moderate	Limited	No	Rating
Involvement	Involvement	Involvement	Involvement	Average
18	72	35	2	2 17

Recommendations for improvement (n>1):

More/Better engagement with families	8
Improve communication between agencies	2
More support groups/workshops	2

Acknowledgements

The Frederick County Local Management Board and the Office for Children and Families would like to thank all those who participated and/or assisted in the completion of the 2013 Community Wide Needs Assessment. Your dedication to the children, youth, and families of Frederick County is very much appreciated.

Office for Children and Families Staff

Christal Hanson

Director, (through July 31, 2013)

Derek R. Belz

Acting Director, (August 1st – Present)

Pat Fleet

Administrative Specialist

Local Management Board Members

Ralph Hertges (Chair)

Private Citizen

Shelly Toms (Co-Chair)

Family Partnership

Shannon Aleshire

Mental Health Association

Barbara Brookmyer

Frederick County Health Department

Marsha Duncan

Private Citizen

Havwood Evans

Developmental Disabilities Administration

Singy Golden

Department of Juvenile Services

Diane Gordy

Department of Social Services

Kathleen Hartsock

Frederick County Public Schools

Chief Thomas Ledwell

Frederick Police Department

Joshua Pedersen

United Way of Frederick County

Bob Pitcher

Mental Health Management Agency

Pat Rosensteel

Frederick County Citizens Services

Melanie Thom

Frederick County Finance

Stacy Wantz

Head Start (YMCA)

Jenifer Winkler

Way Station, Inc.